MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, June 12, 2014 6:00 p.m.

Cottonwood Heights City Council Conference Room 1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 250 Cottonwood Heights, Utah

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Scott Chapman, Jonathan Jay Oldroyd, Laura McCoy, Niels Valentiner

Excused: Scott Peters, Stephen K. Harman, Robyn Taylor-Granda

Staff Present: Senior Planner Glen Goins, Associate Planner Mike Johnson, City

Engineer Brad Gilson

Others Present: Paul Shaw, Rich Cook, Dade Rose, Rick Olsen

BUSINESS MEETING

1.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chair Scott Chapman called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

- 1.1 Review Action Items
- 2.0 ACTION ITEMS
- 2.1 (Project #PUD-14-002) Consideration of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application from Paul Shaw, Shaw Building Group, located at 2495 East Creek Road (Hampton Hollow)

Associate Planner, Mike Johnson, reviewed the proposed PUD ordinance and reported that the application is for a new 13-lot PUD development on 3.02 acres located at 2495 East Creek Road.

Paul Shaw, was present on behalf of Shaw Building Group, and presented information and photos of the proposed project. He believes two critical points for a livable and desirable floor plan include a three-car garage and a covered patio. The south side of the property runs along Creek Road. It is not his intent to gate the property. The applicants would like an interesting cobblestone or brick feature at the entrance. The current fencing along the east side of the property will be replaced with iron fencing.

Commissioner Valentiner is of the opinion that abutting neighbors may want a solid fence allowing for more privacy than an open iron fence.

Mr. Johnson stated that the PUD process allows the Planning Commission to consider a standard different than the street standards for a public right-of-way. With regard to the purview of the

ARC, street design and effective layouts are open to suggestions. Ultimately, the Planning Commission approves a street standard based on staff's recommendation or review indicating that all of the City Engineer's concerns have been mitigated, especially with respect to widths.

Mr. Shaw stated that they prefer wrought iron fencing. Although the surrounding developments are separate entities, they are open to anyone coming to the proposed neighborhood to enjoy the creek. Mr. Johnson confirmed that gates are allowed in the PUD ordinance. Coloring and exterior details were presented.

MOTION: Commissioner Valentiner moved to recommend approval subject to the following: Conditions:

- 1. Contact neighbors on the east side and come to an agreement regarding fencing.
- 2. Comply with standard rear yard setbacks. The livable space of the building shall have a 20-foot setback and the patio shall have a 15-foot setback.
- 3. Parking signs shall be posted indicating that there is to be no parking on the street.
- 4. Follow architecture on all four sides of the home.
- 5. There shall be no entry gate on Creek Road

Mr. Johnson clarified the motion and stated that approval will constitute a Certificate of Design Compliance.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Oldroyd and passed unanimously on a voice vote.

2.2 (Project #PUD 14-001) Consideration of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application from Richard Cook, Sonora Ranch, located at 9160 South Wasatch Boulevard (Giverny)

Senior Planner, Glen Goins, presented the PUD application and stated that the request pertains to the Giverny PUD which consists of 169 lots on 45 acres. Items needing clarification, as recommended by the Commission at the previous meeting, were detailed.

The applicant, Rich Cook, addressed the remaining items. A landscaped rendering was presented. Mr. Cook explained that the plantings and trees will create a dense, corridor feel. The linear park and connecting trail systems, along with the open space and gardens, were displayed. The Giverny Parkway will be built to the standard surface road width plus an additional four-foot parkway and a five-foot sidewalk. The Picasso and Renoir Parkways will feature 34-foot cross sections with the same parkways with an additional sidewalk. All other streets throughout the interior will be the standard street for cross-sections for hard surfacing. In the main corridor of the linear park, the main walkway will have an eight-foot surface with an additional four-foot trail allowing for easy passing. The proposed surface includes granite with a metal barrier on each side. Mr. Cook next detailed the secondary trail, which connects to the primary trail, and will run behind the homes. The proposed fencing will consist of a six-foot high masonry fence moving to

a wood, cedar fence along the north property line to help create continuity with the adjacent

community.

Mr. Cook stated that a calming gate will be proposed. It will open to everyone but will reduce the desire of either party to travel along the parkway at a rapid speed. The consensus of the

neighborhood is that they do not want connectivity into the proposed project.

Mr. Goins stated that with regard to PUD roads, where you see a public connection, one is

expected.

Commissioner Valentiner recommended leaving the roads open for the time being and remain

sensitive to the views of surrounding neighbors. Accessibility for Public Works was discussed.

MOTION: Commissioner Valentiner moved to recommend approval subject to the following

conditions:

1. Respect setbacks of adjacent zone.

2. Hold neighborhood meetings coming to a compromise on surrounding fencing.

3. There shall be no gates, however, they will leave it up to the neighbors, developers

and City to come up with a reasonable solution.

4. Approval by the ARC constitutes the Certificate of Design Compliance.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Oldroyd and passed unanimously on a voice vote

2.3 **Approval of June 12, 2014 Minutes**

No action was taken.

3.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Chair Chapman moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner

3

Oldroyd and passed unanimously on a voice vote.

The Architectural Review Commission meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Minutes approved: 07/10/2014